

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

RICHARD L. QUINN, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Civil Action 2:11-cv-268
Judge James L. Graham
Magistrate Judge E.A. Preston Deavers**

ROBIN KNAB, WARDEN,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court conducted its initial screen of Plaintiff's Complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A on March 31, 2011, causing Plaintiff's Complaint to be filed on that date. (ECF Nos. 3 and 4.) To date, Plaintiff has not effected service of process as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) over Defendants Mohr and Freeman. On December 19, 2011, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within fourteen days why the Court should not dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Mohr and Freeman without prejudice and why the Court should allow an extension of time to effect service. (ECF No. 28.) Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's Show Cause Order. The undersigned, therefore, **RECOMMENDS** that the Court dismiss Defendants Mohr and Freeman from this action without prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m) for failure to timely effect service of process.

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the Report and

Recommendation, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *See, e.g., Pfahler v. Nat'l Latex Prod. Co.*, 517 F.3d 816, 829 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that “failure to object to the magistrate judge’s recommendations constituted a waiver of [the defendant’s] ability to appeal the district court’s ruling”); *United States v. Sullivan*, 431 F.3d 976, 984 (6th Cir. 2005) (holding that defendant waived appeal of district court’s denial of pretrial motion by failing to timely object to magistrate judge’s report and recommendation). Even when timely objections are filed, appellate review of issues not raised in those objections is waived. *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) (“[A] general objection to a magistrate judge’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not suffice to preserve an issue for appeal”) (citation omitted)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: January 9, 2012

/s/ Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers

Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers
United States Magistrate Judge